(10)

MARKETING RESEARCH DEPARTMENT REPORT

MRD # : 80036

DATED: June 9, 1980

WRITTEN BY: Pam Anderson

SUBJECT: HTI Test of "Macho I" With Minty Menthol Versus Merit 85 With Minty Menthol (Project No. 5513/7079)

OVERVIEW

Although this margin wasn't statistically significant, male full flavor king-size menthol smokers tended towards Merit 85 with minty menthol over Macho I with minty menthol by a margin of 54% to 46%. The male low tar king-size menthol smokers equally preferred the two products (50%/50%).

Qualitatively, the full flavor menthol smokers perceived Merit 85 with minty menthol to have "more taste" than "Macho I" with minty menthol.

PA:mb

DISTRIBUTION:

CC: H. Daniel (Rich.)
F. Daylor (Rich.)
T. Goodale
W. McDowell
L. Meyer (Rich.)
J. Morgan
S. Pollack
G. Raed
F. Resnik
R. Seligman (Rich.)
A. Udow
J. Zoler

1002916993

FILE: MACHO I

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/gkkk0000

HTI TEST OF "MACHO I" WITH MINTY MENTHOL VERSUS MERIT 85 WITH MINTY MENTHOL

BACKGROUND

The purpose of this test was to determine the consumer acceptability of "Macho I" with minty menthol relative to Merit 85 with minty menthol. Analytically, the cigarettes differed in that "Macho I" with minty menthol had a lower puff count, a greater percentage of total alkaloids and total reducing sugars, and lower weight of tobacco and rod density. This test was conducted via mail placement/ mail questionnaire among male full flavor king-size menthol smokers and male low tar (excluding ultra-lows) king-size menthol smokers. Both products were tested "blind" in plain white coded packages.

FINDINGS

Male Full Flavor King-Size Menthol Smokers

1. The male full flavor smokers tended to prefer Merit 85 with minty menthol to "Macho I" with minty menthol by a vote of 54%/46%. While there were some fluctuations within the demographic and user subgroups, none of the differences were significant.

   (Table 1; Section B)

2. The average ratings assigned by these smokers to these products on a "worst" (0) to "best" (100) scale are consistent with the overall ratings in that the Merit 85 product (45.32) was rated slightly higher than the "Macho I" product (38.95).

   (Table 1; Section C)

3. A review of the available qualitative information (Reasons For Preference - Table 2; Dislikes - Table 3) indicates that these full flavor menthol smokers perceived Merit 85 with minty menthol to have "more taste" than "Macho I" with minty menthol.

Male Low Tar King-Size Menthol Smokers

4. The male low tar smokers equally preferred "Macho I" with minty menthol (50%) to Merit 85 with minty menthol (50%). While there were some fluctuations within the demographic and user subgroups, none of the differences were significant.

   (Table 1; Section B)

5. The average ratings assigned by these panelists on a "worst" (0) to "best" (100) scale were 48.27 for "Macho I" and 46.14 for Merit 85.

   (Table 1; Section C)

6. A review of the available qualitative information (Reasons For Preference - Table 2; Dislikes - Table 3) indicates that these smokers were unable to detect any meaningful differences between the two products.

1002916994

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/gkkk0000

SECTION A: OVERALL PREFERENCE

	Male Smokers of: FF 80/85mm Men.	LT 80/85mm Men.
N =	(98)	(134)
	%	%
Prefer Macho I with Minty Menthol	34	41
Prefer Merit 85 with Minty Menthol	40	41
No Preference	27	18

SECTION B: % PREFERRING EXPERIMENTAL
(Percentage Among Those Having a Preference)

	FF 80/85 mm Men. Base	FF 80/85 mm Men. % Preferring Macho I w/ Minty Men.	LT 80/85 mm Men. Base	LT 80/85 mm Men. % Preferring Macho I w/ Minty Men.
Total	(72)	46	(110)	50
Under 35 years	(44)	45	(61)	49
35 years and over	(28)	46	(49)	51
Heavy Smokers	(49)	51	(71)	45
Moderate/Light Smokers	(23)	35	(39)	59

SECTION C: AVERAGE RATINGS
(0=Worst; 100=Best)

	Male Smokers of: FF 80/85 mm Men	Lt 80/85 mm Men.
N =	(98)	(134)
Macho I with Minty Menthol	38.95	48.27
Merit 85 with Minty Menthol	45.32	46.14

SECTION D: COMPARISONS FOR SPECIFIC QUALITIES (%)

	Male FF 80/85 mm Men. Smokers			Male LT 80/85 mm Men. Smokers		
	Macho I	Merit	No Diff.	Macho I	Merit	No Diff.
Has more taste	29	46**	26	39	38	23
Has a better taste	34	41	26	39	44	17
Is harsher to the mouth/ throat	28	28	45	35	32	33
Has an easier draw	23	24	52	22	25	54
Has a better aftertaste	31	41	29	37	34	29
Is cooler	35	35	31	37	32	31
Is slower burning	19	21	59	18	19	63
Is milder	35	32	34	38	45	17
Has a better filter	33	36	32	33	40	28
Has a lighter taste	43	37	20	46	35	19
Has a better menthol taste	28	37	36	35	42	23

** Statistically significant @ 90% level.

TABLE 1

1002916995

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/gkkk0000

REASONS FOR PREFERENCE

Base: Those preferring either cigt.	Male Full Flavor 80/85 mm Menthol Smokers		Male Low Tar 80/85 mm Menthol Smokers	
	Preferred Macho I w/ Minty Men. (33) #	Preferred Merit 85 w/ Minty Men. (39) #	Preferred Macho I w/ Minty Men. (55) #	Preferred Merit 85 w/ Minty Men. (55) #
Taste	14	15	25	24
Good taste/tobacco flavor	7	7	15	15
Good/no bad aftertaste	4	3	2	4
Tasted better than others	1	3	6	2
Strong flavor	1	-	1	3
Menthol	17	24	24	21
Milder menthol	7	14	11	12
Liked menthol taste	6	7	8	4
Strong menthol	2	3	2	2
Taste like mint	3	-	-	-
Right amount of menthol	-	-	2	2
Strength	7	8	23	11
Mild, not strong	4	5	18	10
Not harsh	-	3	4	-
Ease In Smoking	3	1	5	7
Easy draw-smoke	2	1	3	6
Burning Qualities	2	2	3	-
Slower burning	2	2	3	-
Effect On Mouth & Throat	3	1	5	2
Not irritating/didn't burn mouth	1	1	2	1
Cool Smoking	2	-	2	-
Miscellaneous	-	3	2	2

TABLE 2

1002916996

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/gkkk0000

DISLIKES ABOUT EACH CIGARETTE

Base:	Male Full Flavor 80/85 mm Menthol Smokers		Male Low Tar 80/85 mm Menthol Smokers	
	Macho I w/ Minty Men.	Merit 85 w/ Minty Men.	Macho I w/ Minty Men.	Merit 85 w/ Minty Men.
	98		134	
	#	#	#	#
Taste	15	18	26	28
Poor flavor/disliked taste	6	3	11	11
Left bad aftertaste	5	3	6	5
Flavor too mild	3	5	4	6
Flavor too strong	-	5	2	3
Menthol	30	38	41	31
Too strong menthol flavor	27	31	34	25
Taste like mint	3	2	4	3
Not enough menthol flavor	1	6	2	3
Strength	12	11	24	20
Too strong	6	6	15	13
Too mild	6	5	9	6
Filter	14	10	7	6
Dislike long filter	13	9	6	5
Burning Qualities	9	6	13	14
Burned too fast	9	6	11	14
Effect On Mouth/Throat	5	6	4	9
Irritated mouth/burned throat	4	5	2	6
Difficulty In Smoking	3	4	5	3
Not easy drawing	2	3	4	2
Too easy drawing	1	1	1	1
Physical Characteristics	3	1	1	2
Not Cool Smoking	1	1	-	2
Miscellaneous	5	6	9	5
Not satisfying	2	2	2	2
Poor aroma	1	2	5	3

TABLE 3

1002916997

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/gkkk0000

TO: Mr. J. E. Wickham DATE: February 26, 1980

FROM: Elizabeth Chambers

SUBJECT: HTI #5513/7079

Submitted By: J. Duggins

5513 = M9EY-2 = "Macho I" 85 Cigarettes With Minty Menthol
7079 = M9EZ-1 = Merit 85 Cigarettes With Minty Menthol

The "Macho I" 85 cigarettes (M9EY-2) with minty menthol were different from the Merit 85 cigarettes (M9EZ-1) with minty menthol in the following characteristics: puff count, total alkaloids, total reducing sugars, tobacco weight and rod density.

	"Macho I" 85 With Minty Menthol	Merit 85 With Minty Menthol
IBM Code	M9EY-2	M9EZ-1
HTI No.	5513	7079
Smoke		
Butt Length, mm	35	35
FTC Tar, mg/cigt.	9.2	9.8
Nicotine, mg/cigt.	0.70	0.74
Puffs/cigt.	7.9	8.8
Filtration Eff., %	45	47
Cigarette		
Total RTD, in. of H_2O	3.7	3.5
Static Burn. Time, min.	7.4	6.7
Length, mm	84.2	84.3
Circumference, mm	25.0	25.0
Paper		
Additive, type	Cit.	Cit.
Porosity, sec.	13	12
Filter		
RTD, in. of H_2O	3.0	3.0
Length, mm	27.2	27.1
Weight, g	0.18	0.17
Tipping paper length, mm	32	32
Dilution, %	38	37
Filler		
Total alkaloids, %	1.88	1.66
Total reducing sugars, %	5.6	4.6
Wt. of tob., g	0.649	0.712
Rod Density, g/cc	0.229	0.250
Menthol, mg/cigt.		
Smoke	0.59	0.54
Filler	4.8	4.6
Filter	1.0	0.8

EC:gmm

cc: Mr. B. A. Soyars
Dr. R. B. Seligman
Mr. W. G. Lloyd
Dr. W. F. Gannon
Mr. R. N. Thomson
Mr. T. T. Goodale
Mr. J. Zoler
Mr. G. F. Raed
Mr. J. S. Osmalov
Mr. F. L. Daylor
Mr. H. G. Daniel
Mr. H. L. Spielberg
Mr. C. N. Kounnas
Ms. J. Duggins

Elizabeth Chambers

1002916998

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/gkkk0000